

REMARKS

By the above actions, claims 16, 17, 26, 27, 28 & 30 have been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, further consideration of this application is requested.

Claims 16-28 and 30 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kostadinov (USP 7,032,045) in view of Gothe et al. (USP 6,049,577). To the extent that these rejections relate to the claims as now presented, they are inappropriate for the following reasons.

Kostadinov differs from the invention of independent claim 16, 26 and 30 in that Kostadinov is directed to a complete computer system that is connected to a bus. Referring to FIG. 2 of Kostadinov, the complete computer system includes communication interface 201, processor 210, sensor 230, controller/driver 240, user interface 270, and memory 220. The connection to the sensor 230 and to the controller/driver 240 that is further connected to a device 150 evidences that Kostadinov is directed to a computer based control system.

Thus, the system of Kostadinov differs in many ways from the inventions of independent claim 16, 26 and 30, as amended, which are directed to a field bus adaptor, method and software, because a field bus adaptor is only able to convert data into a field bus communication protocol or receive data from the field bus protocol, and convert the data to other types of data. Accordingly, the inventions of independent claim 16, 26 and 30 are optimized for field bus operations, as compared to the system of Kostadinov.

In addition, based on the entire disclosure of Kostadinov, those of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to reduce the described hardware and software of Kostadinov into a very small adaptor that can just be connected to a field bus and perform all communication to and from the field bus, as is advantageously possible with the inventions of independent claim 16, 26 and 30.


Gothé et al. fails to cure the noted deficiencies in Kostadinov and is directed to header synchronization detectors in wireless communication. With the system of Gothé et al., a much different treatment of signals is necessary in order to avoid failures in the transmitted signals, as compared to field bus operations. Accordingly, those of ordinary skill in the art would not consider Gothé et al. and arrive at the inventions of independent claim 16, 26 and 30 based on Gothé et al., because Gothé et al. concerns wireless communication. By contrast, in the technical field of the inventions of independent claim 16, 26 and 30, where field busses

are used, there is often a very noisy electrical environment, so that noise would be picked up immediately, if one were to try to use wireless communication.

Thus, amended independent claims 16, 26 and 30 are patentably distinguishable over Kostadinov, and Gothe et al., alone or in combination.

Therefore, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being discovered, this application should now be in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that, after consideration of this response, any issues should remain, or any new issues arise, or should the Examiner believe some additional modification of the claims could enable approval thereof and such could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and/or implementing of an Examiner's Amendment, so as to thereby facilitate prompt approval of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C
PO Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273

DSS:kmm